

# MICHIGAN'S ESEA FLEXIBILITY RENEWAL REQUEST

*PRESENTATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION*

February 10, 2015



# Supporting SBE/MDE Priorities

- ESEA Flexibility offers us an opportunity to further some of our key priorities:
  - ▣ All Michigan students graduate ready for college, careers and community.
  - ▣ Closing achievement gaps
  - ▣ Increasing early literacy and reading proficiency in third grade.
  - ▣ Developing and supporting a workforce that can achieve these goals

# Do we have to do ESEA Flex?

- No. States who wish to receive Title funding and not participate in ESEA Flexibility can choose instead to implement the original NCLB requirements
- We will review some specific impacts at the end of this presentation if we make that decision.
- However—we believe ESEA Flexibility can be a vehicle for us to accomplish our key goals.

# Process and Timeline

- Current ESEA Flexibility approval expires at end of 2014-15 school year
- Approved Renewal will extend through 2017-18 school year
- Renewal Request due to USED on March 31, 2015

# Stakeholder Engagement

- Extensive stakeholder engagement during development of Renewal
  - ▣ Implementation of ESEA Flexibility to-date
  - ▣ Proposed changes in Renewal Request
  
- Public Comment in mid-March 2015

# Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students

*States must demonstrate their continued commitment to ensure that all students graduate from high school ready for college and careers, through implementation of career- and college-ready standards and assessments, including supports for all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, low-achieving students, economically disadvantaged students, and teachers of those students.*

# A note on standards and testing

- ESEA Flexibility does not specifically require a certain set of standards or assessments.
- The focus on career and college ready standards and assessments aligns with MDE's mission.
- The current testing structure we have is not mandated by ESEA Flex, but rather a mix of No Child Left Behind and state law.

# Principle 1: Proposed New Content

- Statewide initiative targeting 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading proficiency
- Updates to Michigan's multi-tiered systems of support initiatives
- Updates to professional learning for teachers and principals
- Postsecondary access and persistence data and supports



# Principle 2: State-Developed Systems of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

*States must demonstrate their continued commitment to continuous improvement of systems and processes supporting implementation of the system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support.*

# Principle 2: Proposed New Content

- Move from annual to three-year identification cycle for Priority, Focus and Reward Schools
  - ▣ Next “naming” year to be fall 2017 following two years of data under same assessment
  - ▣ Consideration of new metrics to identify Focus Schools
  - ▣ Various levels of supports for low-performing schools in non-naming years

# Proposed Accountability Cycle

	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
What is reported publicly?	Possible parent dashboard State-level assessment results	Possible parent dashboard State-level assessment results	Priority, Focus and Reward Schools Scorecard for all other schools
What is reported securely to districts/schools?	Scorecard At-risk of Priority and Focus notifications Student-level information	Scorecard At-risk of Priority and Focus notifications Student-level information	Student-level information
What are accountability consequences?	None (unless do not participate)	None (unless do not participate)	Entry into Priority and Focus status

# Focus Metrics

- Current Focus metric
  - ▣ Identify the bottom 30% lowest performing students
  - ▣ Determine the gap between the bottom 30% and top 30%
- Possible new metrics:
  - ▣ Still look at the performance of the bottom 30% but also remove schools from consideration where their bottom 30% meets a set target in proficiency or growth
  - ▣ Calculate in only ELA and math

# Principle 2: Proposed New Content

- Scorecard reporting options: possible move from colors to A-F grading system
  - ▣ Want to find agreement around what sort of labeling system makes sense
  - ▣ 14 states use A-F grading (example: Florida)
  - ▣ 8 use levels 1-5 (example: Massachusetts)
  - ▣ The rest use between 3-5 labels (“exemplary,” “good” “needs improvement” “emerging” etc.)

# Principle 2: Proposed New Content

- Priority and Focus Interventions and Supports
  - ▣ Move to more district-focused turnaround interventions with greater leadership and accountability for local superintendents
  - ▣ Five levels of intervention support for Priority Schools
  - ▣ Exit criteria from Priority and Focus status

# Principle 2: Proposed New Content

- Internal MDE capacity to provide tiered support to local districts and schools
- Additional optional waiver to utilize earmarked federal funds to support low-performing schools after certain criteria have been met

# Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

*States must demonstrate their continued commitment to implementation of teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that use multiple measures of performance, including student growth as a significant factor.*



# Principle 3: Proposed New Content

- Delay required use of state assessment data until results from 2016-17 state assessments are available following two years of data under same assessment
- Focus on Student Learning Objectives (SLO)
- Additional focus on the relationship between educator evaluations and adult professional learning

# What happens if Michigan's ESEA Flexibility is not renewed?

- Starting in 2015-16, Michigan must
  - ▣ Revert to identification of schools as identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring
  - ▣ Calculate adequate yearly progress (AYP) and make identifications based on the 100% proficient by 2014 requirement

# What happens if Michigan's ESEA Flexibility is not renewed?

- Districts with schools identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring
  - ▣ Must set aside 20% of Title I allocation to provide supplemental education services (SES) and transportation for public school choice
  - ▣ Will have less flexibility in the transfer and use of certain Title program funds

# What happens if Michigan's ESEA Flexibility is not renewed?

- The MDE must
  - ▣ Award new SIG grants based on Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III identifications only
  - ▣ Limit new school-wide Title I programs to those schools with greater than 40% poverty

# QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

**Natasha Baker**

*Deputy Superintendent of Education Services and  
State School Reform Officer*

**Venessa Keesler, Ph.D.**

*Deputy Superintendent, Accountability Services*

**Abbie Groff-Blaszak,**

*Special Assistant*